

# The Gazette of India



EXTRAORDINARY

PART II—Section 3

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 196]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 25, 1953

ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 8th July 1953

**S.R.O. 1458.**—Whereas the election of Shri Subodh Narain Yadava, as a member of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Bihar, from the Benipatti East constituency of that Assembly, has been called in question by an Election Petition duly presented under Part VI of the Representation of the People Act 1951 (XLIII of 1951), by Shri Anand Chandra Mishra, son of Late Pandit Ramachandra Mishra, Village Bhagjari, P S Benipatti, Sub-Division Madhubani, District Darbhanga,

And whereas, the Election Tribunal appointed by the Election Commission, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 86 of the said Act, for the trial of the said Election Petition has, in pursuance of the provisions contained in section 103 of the said Act, sent a copy of its Order to the Commission;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 106 of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby publishes the said Order of the Tribunal

BEFORE THE ELECTION TRIBUNAL, PATNA

PRESIDENT

Shri Basu Prasad, Retired District Judge—*Chairman*

Shri Hargobind Prasad Sinha, Retired District Judge—*Member*.

Shri Aditya Narayan Lal, Advocate—*Member*.

ELECTION PETITION No 128 of 1952

In the matter of election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from Benipatti—East Constituency in Madhubani Sub-Division of Darbhanga District.

Anand Chandra Mishra son of late Pandit Ramchandra Mishra, by caste Brahmin Malthil, resident of village Dhagjari, P S Benipatti Sub-division Madhubani, District Darbhanga—*Petitioner*.

*Versus*

- 1 Subodh Narain Yadava, son of Mauze Yadava alive, by caste Yadava, resident of village Perjuari Champa, Thana Benipatti, Sub-Division Madhubani, District Darbhanga,
2. Bhogendra Jha, son of Bansmani Jha, resident of village Raghupur Ithar, tola Barha, Thana Benipatti, District Darbhanga
- 3 Sheikh Ghafoor, son of Sheikh Latayaf Hussain of village Khairbanka, P S Benipatti, Sub-Division Madhubani District Darbhanga,
- 4 Baidyanath Jha, son of Sunderlal Jha of village Behta, Thana Benipatti District Darbhanga—*Respondents*.

*For Respondent No. 1—1. Shri A. N. Chakraverty—Advocate.*

*2. Shri Kedar Nath Thakur—Advocate.*

*For Respondent No. 1—1. Shri A. N. Chakraverty—Advocate.*

*2. Shri K. P. Verma—Advocate.*

*For Respondent No. 2—Shri Sheo Kumar Singh—Advocate.*

The petitioner, Shri Anand Chandra Mishra, and the respondents were candidates for election to the Bihar State Legislative Assembly from Benipatti—East Constituency in Madhubani sub-division of Darbhanga District. On the election that was held, Respondent No. 1, Shri Subodh Narain Jadav secured 6891 votes. The petitioner obtained 6302 votes and the other candidates secured lesser votes. So, respondent No. 1 was declared elected.

The Petitioner has challenged the election of the Respondent No. 1 on the following grounds. His case is that respondent No. 1 had committed corrupt practice of undue influence, coercion, and intimidation, in as much as he had held out threats that the Goalas who would not vote for him would be ex-communicated. He had also held out threats to the voters of other castes that if they did not vote for him, they would be beaten, molested, and would not be allowed to cast their votes. In fact, some of the voters were assaulted, and some were prevented from casting their votes. Respondent No. 1 had also, by practising fraud and misrepresentation, brought about irregularities and non-observance of the rules relating to the election which have materially affected the result of the election. The booth selected for recording the votes of village Nahas Rupauli had been fixed at Nahas Rupauli U.P. School and a booth had been also constructed there. Respondent No. 1 constructed a fresh booth at village Khangraitha in the High English School situated there and induced the Presiding Officer to hold the election there. The petitioner and his agents were un-aware of this change. On 11th January 1952, they, the agents of the other candidates as also some voters had collected at Nahas Rupauli U.P. School for the recording of votes. But they learnt at 10 A.M. that polling was taking place at Nahas Khangraitha. The petitioner and the other candidates had in the beginning no polling agents at Khangraitha. Taking advantage of it, a large number of bogus persons cast their votes in favour of Respondent No. 1. Some voters did not know the change made in the booth, while others were prevented from going to Khangraitha for casting their votes. The result was that the petitioner obtained 15 votes only, while respondent No. 1 secured 796 votes. The petitioner claims that, if the votes cast at Khangraitha booth be excluded, he had secured the largest number of votes. So, on these allegations, the petitioner has claimed the relief that the election of respondent No. 1 be set aside and that the petitioner be declared duly elected.

In the list attached to the petition, the petitioner has given particulars of corrupt practices alleged to have been committed by respondent No. 1 and his men. List (A) contains the names of persons who are alleged to have committed corrupt practices of undue influence, coercion, and intimidation by holding out threats to the Goalas that if they did not vote for respondent No. 1 they would be ex-communicated. List (B) contains the names of persons who are said to have been threatened with assault and molestation and that they would not be allowed to cast their votes if they would not vote for respondent No. 1. List (C) contains the names of persons who were actually prevented from casting their votes. List (D) contains the names of persons who were actually assaulted.

Respondent No. 1 has filed a written statement denying the allegations of corrupt practices, irregularities and non-observance of the rules at the election. He has claimed that there was no interference with the free exercise of the right of franchise by the electors of the constituency in question. According to him, village Nahas Rupauli consists of 3 tolas, named Nahas, Rupauli, and Khangraitha. There is no such School as Nahas Rupauli U.P. School, but there is a Board U.P. School situated in Rupauli. There is an M. E. School known as Nahas Khangraitha M. E. School situated near Khangraitha basti, but outside it, in open field. There is also an H. E. School situated in the compound of M. E. School. The booth selected was the M. E. School, and not the U.P. School, and the Sub-Insp. of Police had wrongly constructed the booth at the U.P. School. So, the Presiding Officer acted rightly in holding the polling at the M.E. School and no prejudice was thereby done to any of the candidates.

Respondent No. 1 filed an additional written statement claiming that the petition filed by the petitioner was not maintainable, as Shri Mohan Jha, who was a duly nominated candidate, had not been made a party to the proceeding.

Respondent No. 2, Shri Bhogendra Jha, has also filed a written statement. He claims that the corrupt practices of undue influence, coercion, intimidation, and

threat to cause injury, ex-communication etc. were widely prevalent and there was no free exercise of the right of voting. He further claims that corrupt practices alleged against the respondent No. 1 were far more numerous than those alleged by the petitioner. But the petitioner and his agents did not also lag behind in committing the same corrupt practices. So, he claims that the entire election is void and the petitioner is not entitled to get the relief that he be declared elected in place of respondent No. 1.

On the case made out by the parties, the following issues were framed for trial.

#### ISSUES

1. Is the election petition maintainable?
2. Is the petitioner's allegation that the election in question was not a free election by reason that the corrupt practices of undue influence, coercion and intimidation had extensively prevailed at the election true?
3. Did the respondent No. 1 and his supporters commit corrupt practices as alleged in the election petition? Was the election of the Respondent No. 1 procured or induced, or was the result of the election materially affected, by such corrupt practices?
4. Was there irregularity and non-observance of the rules at the election as alleged by the petitioner? If so, was the result of the election materially affected thereby?
5. Was the election in the constituency in question wholly void?
6. Is the election of the Respondent No. 1 liable to be set aside?
7. Is the petitioner entitled to a declaration that he has been duly elected?

#### FINDINGS

*Issue No. 4.*—Before dealing with the question which requires determination under this issue, it would be better to mention certain undisputed facts which have got a bearing on the said question.

The village, with the polling booth of which we are concerned, is known as Nahas Rupauli. The village Nahas Rupauli consists of 3 separate tolas, namely:—Nahas, Rupauli, and Khangraitha, which are at a distance of about  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 mile from one another. In tola Nahas, persons of all communities live and no community predominates. But in Rupauli the Brahmin community, to which the petitioner belongs, predominates, while in Khangraitha the Goala community, of which the Respondent No. 1 is a member, predominates. There is no School in Nahas. In Rupauli there is an U.P. School known as Board U.P. School, and not named as Nahas Rupauli U.P. School. Near tola Khangraitha, there is a Middle English School named Nahas Khangraitha M. E. School, and not named as Nahas Rupauli M. E. School. There is also an H.E. School in the compound at the M. E. School. So, there is only one U.P. School and only one M. E. School in villages Nahas Rupauli.

It appears that the petitioner and his supporters were anxious to have the polling booth for village Nahas Rupauli located at Rupauli U.P. School, while Respondent No. 1 and his supporters were anxious to have it located at Khangraitha, M. E. School.

The allegation of the petitioner is that the polling booth, which was located at Rupauli U. P. School, was all of sudden shifted to the M. E. School without any information to the candidates for election or the voters. But this allegation is not supported by the documentary evidence on the record which rather goes to show that the polling booth was intended to be located at the Middle English School from the very beginning and that an attempt was made at a late stage to shift it to the U.P. School.

Before the final selection of the sites for the different polling booths, a provisional list (Ext. 10) was prepared and it was sent to Shri Rajendra Nath Sinha (P.W. 13) for check and report. The list shows that the site of the polling booth mentioned in it for village Nahas Rupauli was Nahas Rupauli M. E. School. The note made by P.W. 13 on the list shows that that he had preferred the U.P. School and had suggested certain modifications to be made in the building of the School. Perhaps, such modifications, were not possible and so in spite of his recommendations the list as finally published (Exts. 6 and 6-A) mentioned Nahas Rupauli M. E. School as the polling booth for village Nahas Rupauli. It is true that the name given in the list is not Nahas Khangraitha M. E. School which is the name of the School on paper. But this need not have caused any confusion

and in fact did not cause any confusion so as to justify the changing of the polling booth from the Middle English to the U. P. School. The dominant description of the site of the polling booth is the M. E. School and Nahas Rupauli only defines the place, where this School is situated. If there had been any other M. E. School in village Nahas Rupauli, then there would have been some excuse for saying that the description of the M. E. School as given in the list was incorrect and there was difficulty in locating the site of the polling booth. But when there was only one M. E. School, there could be no such difficulty, and we do not see how a polling booth intended to be located at a Middle English School could be set up at an U. P. School on the excuse that there was no such School as Nahas Rupauli M. E. School. In his connection, one should also remember that the U. P. School, which was sought to be preferred to the M. E. School, is not known as Nahas Rupauli U. P. School, but is known as Board U. P. School, Rupauli.

The petitioner had obtained a list of polling stations long before the erection of the polling booths. But he raised no objection that the polling station selected as Nahas Rupauli M. E. School was non-existent and incorrect and so some other site should be selected for the location of the polling station. On the other hand, Ext. 5 series which are letters of appointment of polling agents, show that even on 1st January 1952 the petitioner himself mentioned Nahas Rupauli M. E. School as the polling station at which they were to work.

Ext. 1 dated 31st December 1951, is a letter of appointment of a polling agent of another candidate Shri Baijnath Jha. It also shows that he had appointed the polling agent to work at Nahas M. E. School. The village notices, Ext. F. Series which were issued to villagers giving them information as regards location of their polling station mention the "Middle English School". It is also in evidence that the location of the polling booth for Nahas Rupauli at the Middle English School was duly proclaimed in the 3 tolas of Nahas Rupauli by beat of drum and material for construction of the enclosure were collected there. The work was also begun. But the enclosure could not be completed as M. Naem, Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police, who was in charge of this work was suddenly recalled. There was no trouble or confusion as regards the location of the polling station for Nahas Rupauli till the Sub-Inspector of Benipatti Police station Shri Krishna Singh (P.W. 14) took into his head to construct the polling booth at the U. P. School. It appears that he also prevailed upon the other officers including the Returning Officer (Sub-Divisional Officer, Madhubani) to accept the change made by him, and the Returning Officer was also induced to write to the Election Commission Delhi, to approve the change of the polling station from Nahas Rupauli M. E. School to Nahas Rupauli U. P. School. The Commission was not in the know of the full facts of the case and it approved the suggested change as shown by the letter Ext. 9. But the approval was received rather late as the voting was over by the time any proper action would be taken on it.

The Returning Officer (P.W. 16) has said that a telegram approving of the change was received by him before the commencement of the Poll. But it is significant that this telegram is missing, and it could not be said definitely when it was actually received by him. But this much is clear that no proper action to notify the change made in the location of the polling station was taken on the basis of the telegram. The Returning officer has admitted that no village notice notifying the change was issued. There is also nothing to show that any oral notice by means of proclamation was given to the villagers informing them of the change made in the polling station after the change had been approved by the Election Commission. The S.I. of Police has claimed that after the constructions of the polling booth at the U. P. School, he had informed the residents of the three tolas of Nahas Rupauli when he happened to meet that the polling would take place at the Rupauli U. P. School. But this cannot be sufficient in the eye of Law as the Sub-Inspector of Police had no right to take such an action of his own accord, and his mere speaking about the change in the booth to a few villagers cannot be sufficient and cannot take the place of the publication of the village notice by beat of drum. Moreover, this was done before the approval by the election Commission of the suggested change. It has been claimed that the Presiding Officer of the polling station in question had been informed of the change made in its location. But none of the officers, who have come forward to give evidence for the petitioner, has stated that he had personally spoken to the Presiding Officer or written to him regarding the change made in the location of the polling station. All that has been said is that the Presiding Officer had been informed through Chaukidar Janki Mallah who was not even chowkidar of village Nahas Rupauli, that the polling would take place at the U. P. School. But Janki Mallah has not been examined. On the other hand, P.W. 12, the senior polling officer, has stated that no such information was given to him and his party. When

the Presiding Officer and his staff reached the M. E. School, they found the enclosure there incomplete. They received information that an enclosure had been constructed at the U.P. School. The Presiding Officer also visited this enclosure. But he decided not to hold the polling there as the enclosure was small and the space insufficient and as the list supplied to him showed that the M. E. School had been selected as the site of the polling booth. Before this, the Presiding officer had received a letter, Ext. D. with its enclosure. The letter shows that Police officers in some instances had set up enclosures at wrong places and it directed the Presiding Officers to get enclosures erected at right places. So, in view of this letter and what the Presiding Officer found at the U.P. School, he cannot be blamed for holding the polling at the M. E. School when he had no official information of the change made in the site of the booth.

An attempt has been made to justify the change of the site of the booth by making suggestion that the M. E. School was not in existence at the time and that, even if it was in existence, it was not a recognised institution. There is no truth in the suggestion that the M. E. School was not in existence at the time when sites for polling booths were being selected. The claim that it was not a recognised institution has got no substance and we attach no value to it. It is evident that the location of a polling booth in a school has got nothing to do with its recognition by the appropriate authority and the authority selecting the site is concerned only with its building and its location.

So, having regard to the location of the M. E. School and the space available there it was a proper place for location of the booth instead of the U. P. School. It has been argued that after the Election Commission had approved of the location of the polling booth at the U.P. School, the holding of the polling at the M. E. School was wrong and could not be justified. But in this connection it should be remembered that no information to this effect was conveyed either to the Presiding officer or to the voters. So mere change on paper in the site of the booth would not be sufficient unless proper steps are taken to duly notify the change by issuing necessary proclamation. No evidence has been also led to show that voters had been misled and were unable to cast votes by reason of the holding of the poll at the M. E. School. The only evidence given is that a large number of voters had collected at the U.P. School booth in the morning of 11th January 1952, but they had to go away as there was no Presiding officer to record their votes. The witnesses who have come forward to make a statement to this effect have said that they had learned from Mr. Alam (Magistrate in charge) that polling was going on at the M. E. School and the latter had asked them to go there to cast their votes. So, even the voters who are said to have collected at the U. P. School under some wrong information had got the information that the M. E. School was the real polling booth. The polling booth at the U. P. School or the M. E. School was meant only for the residents of the 3 tolas of village Nahas Rupauli.

It is simply impossible to believe that when the polling took place at the M. E. School the residents of any of the tolas were unaware of it. Voters of tola Rupauli were to vote on 12th January 1952 after voting had taken place for full one day for Khangraitha and part of Nahas [vide Exts. 6, 25 and 25(a)]. So, it cannot be claimed that any resident of tola Rupauli was misled by holding of the poll at the M. E. School. It is true that only one elector of Tola Rupauli cast his vote. Even Bhagirath Miser, who was polling agent of the petitioner at the M. E. School and who is resident of Tola Rupauli, did not cast his vote. But simply because only one voter cast his vote, it cannot be claimed that the voters of Tola Rupauli were misled and so did not cast their votes. There may be many reasons for this queer action on their part. We need not investigate it and try to ascertain the real motive behind it. Respondent No. 1, however, has given some evidence explaining this attitude on the part of Rupauli electors. Even if the polling should have taken place at the U. P. School instead of at the M. E. School we are convinced that no voter was misled on account of it and that no prejudice was caused to any one of the candidates. So, we decide this issue in favour of Respondent No. 1.

*Issues Nos. 2 and 3.*—The allegations of the petitioner which have given rise to issues Nos. 2 and 3, have not been seriously pressed before us for the obvious reason that the evidence which has been adduced is not sufficient to support them. As already indicated, the petitioner has divided his allegations in 4 parts, namely:—

(A), (B), (C) and (D),

In list (A) is given the names of the persons who are said to have threatened their caste-men with ex-communication, if they would not vote for Respondent No. 1. One of the persons, who is said to have held out this threat, is Turant Jadav

But he was appointed polling agent of the petitioner at the M. E. School polling booth. It is difficult to believe that the petitioner could have appointed as polling agent a person in whom he had no confidence and that such a person would go to the extent of actively working against his interest. Turant Jadav has been examined as R.W. 12 and he denies the allegations made against him.

The list A shows that residents of 11 villages were threatened with ex-communication. But it is significant that even when this threat is said to have been practised on such an extensive scale, not a single Gowala has come forward to speak about it, though they are said to have been compelled to act against their will and conscience.

The list D gives the names of persons who are said to have been assaulted. But this claim has not been pressed before us. Further particulars, namely, the percentage and residence of persons named in the List (D) were not supplied in spite of the Tribunal's order to that effect.

The list C gives the names of persons who are said to have been prevented from voting under threat held out by Respondent No. 1 and his supporters. The list gives the names of 8 persons and they are all of Tola Rupauli and are Brahmins by caste, the caste to which the petitioner belongs. Out of them, on 3, namely, P.W. 2 Mayanand Jha, P.W. 5 Kuseswar Jha and P.W. 11 Regi Choudhry have been examined. Their evidence is conflicting and un-reliable. It is said that on the day, on which the polling of Tola Rupauli was taking place, respondent No. 1 and his supporters were waiting outside the polling booth at some distance from it and had compelled the witnesses, who were going to the booth to cast their votes, to return home.

According to P.W. 2, Subodh Jadav (Respondent No. 1) and Jamadar Jadav had threatened him. But the list C does not give the name of Subodh Jadav and mentions two other names Bilat Jadav and Biso Jadav.

P.W. 3 has deposed that one Maujei Jadav and Lakshmi Jadav and one more, whose name he does not remember, had threatened him and had compelled him to turn back. While P.W. 11 has stated that Buddhan Jadav, Gauku Jadav and 2 or 4 others men had threatened him. When Subodh Jadav and his companions were waiting at a particular place to prevent the residents of Tola Rupauli from going to the polling booth, it is difficult to see how different sets of persons had prevented these 3 persons from proceeding to the polling booth. Two of them, namely, P.W. 2 and P.W. 3, have stated that on return home they had spoken about the incident to some of the villagers. They have even claimed that they had spoken to Mr. Alam about the threat which was being held out to them. But the men of Tola Rupauli, to whom this incident is said to have been reported, have not been examined in support of it and Mr. Alam has not also spoken about the threat which is said to have been held out to the residents of Tola Rupauli. It cannot be disputed that even if there be some obstruction on the straight path leading to a particular place, one can reach that place, if he has a mind to do so, by making a detour or by passing through the fields. So, if the 3 witnesses had a mind to cast their votes, it would not have been difficult for them to reach the polling booth, specially when, according to the arrangement made for the polling, the police were also on duty near about the polling booth. So, we do not believe the statements made by these 3 witnesses.

The list (B) gives the names of persons who are said to have been threatened with assault and molestation and had been told that they would not be allowed to vote if they would not vote for respondent No. 1. The list (B) gives the names of 28 persons and out of them only 6, namely, P.W. 4 (Nathuni Thakur), P.W. 6 (Sahebji Jha), P.W. 7 (Lootan Jha), P.W. 8 (Jagdish Jha), P.W. 9 (Lakshman Jha) and P.W. 10 (Chandra Shekhar Jha) have been examined. P.W. 4 Nathuni Thakur was the polling agent of the petitioner at Parkauli booth. According to the list, Madho Jadav is said to have threatened him. But his evidence shows that respondent No. 1 had also joined in this threat and that the threat was held out in the very presence of the Presiding Officer. It is difficult to believe that respondent No. 1 and Madho Jadav could have acted so foolishly as to hold out threat in the very presence of the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer or some of the Polling Officers would have been the best witness to speak about this alleged threat, but none of them has been examined.

Sahebji Jha (P.W. 6) has stated that he was threatened by Jadu and Bhadal. But notwithstanding that, he was able to cast his vote. So, we do not believe that there is any truth in his statement.

Lootan Jha (P.W. 7) has stated that Tilak Jadav and Harnandan Jadav has threatened him. But in the list 3 persons have been mentioned, namely Tilak, Harnandan and Nandlal. He had also cast his vote inspite of the alleged threat. So, we do not believe his statement to be true.

Jagdish Jha (P.W. 8) has stated that he was unable to do his work fully as polling agent of the petitioner on account of the threat held out to him by respondent No. 1 and his supporters. He admits that he did the work of polling agent on all the 4 days on which the polling was held at Champa booth. He appears to be an important member of the Congress and it is difficult to believe that he could have been deterred from doing his work on account of the alleged threat held out to him. He claims to have filed a written complaint before the Presiding Officer, but it has not been produced in support of his allegation.

Lakshman Jha (P.W. 9) has spoken about the threats held out to others, but has not spoken about any threat being held out to him. According to the statement made in the list B, he was also threatened by respondent No. 1 and others. He was the polling agent of the Congress candidate for the House of People and had cast his vote. His evidence is not disinterested and reliable.

Chandreshkhar Jha (P.W. 10) of Rupauli has said that while he was going to the polling booth to cast his vote, he and his companions were threatened by Subodh Jadav and others and were prevented from casting their votes. But neither the name of P.W. 10 nor of any of his companions finds place in list (C) which gives names of residents of Rupauli who were actually prevented from voting. The names of his companions are also not given in list (B) he has named Subodh Jadav and three others who had threatened him and his companions. But the list B gives names of seven persons.

The petitioner has examined Ahmad Mian (P.W. 5) to speak about the threat which is said to have been held out to him and other voters. But P.W. 5 has not been mentioned in the list. On the other hand, respondent No. 1 has examined Ashraf Chamar (P.W. 21) who has denied that any threat was held out to him. He has also examined some of the persons who are said to have held out threats on behalf of respondent No. 1. They are Turant Jadav (R.W. 14), Budhan Jadav (R.W. 15), Jadu Jadav (R.W. 16), and Sham Lal Jadav (R.W. 19). They have denied that they had held out any threat on behalf of respondent No. 1 as alleged. It has already been pointed out that one of them named Turant Jha, was a polling agent of the petitioner. We see no reason to disbelieve the evidence of the above-named witnesses who were examined by respondent No. 1.

For these reasons we decide these issues in favour of respondent No. 1.

*Issue No. 1.*—It has been argued that the petition is not maintainable on account of non-joinder of Shri Mohan Jha who was a duly nominated candidate. This aspect of the case need not be discussed and decided as on the main issue of the case the petitioner has failed to establish his claim and as on such failure the election petition has to be dismissed.

*Issues Nos. 5, 6 and 7.*—In view of our findings on issues Nos. 2, 3 and 4, we decide these issues against the petitioner.

The result, therefore, is that the election petition fails.

#### ORDER

The election petition be dismissed. The petitioner shall bear his own costs and shall pay Rs. 500 (five hundred) as costs to the respondent No. 1.

HIGH COURT, PATNA.

The 25th June, 1953.

(Sd.) BASU PRASAD, *Chairman.*

(Sd.) HARGOBIND PRASAD SINHA, *Member.*

(Sd.) ADITYA NARAYANLAL, *Member.*

[No 19/128/52-Elec.III/11190.]

By Order,

P. R. KRISHNAMURTHY, *Asstt. Secy.*

